

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MATP-617US

OCT 11 2006

Appln. No.: 09/997,391
Amendment Dated October 11, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 11, 2006

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 15, 16 and 21 have been amended. No new matter is introduced herein. Claim 2 has been canceled. Claims 1, 3-6 and 9-24 are pending.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's finding that claims 3, 4, 11-14, 17-19, 23 and 24 are allowable.

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer (U.S. Pat. No. 6,678,659) in view of Guedalia (U.S. Pat. No. 6,707,891). Claim 2 has been canceled. It is respectfully submitted that this ground for rejection for the remaining claims is overcome for the reasons set forth below.

Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to include the indicated allowable features of receiving and storing electronic program guide (EPG) speech files at an information appliance and navigating through the stored EPG speech files in response to aural prompts. The Examiner has acknowledged, on p. 9 of the Office Action of May 11, 2006, that these features are not disclosed or suggested by the cited art. Support for the amendment to claims 1 and 15 can be found, for example, at paragraph [0041]. Claims 1 and 15 have also been amended to include that the portion of the EPG speech files corresponds to a particular time interval. Support for this feature can be found, for example, at paragraph [0041].

Regarding claims 1 and 15, Van Kommer discloses, in Fig. 1, a voice teleservice system including a centralized platform 1 which manages dialogue with the user when used as an interactive system (Col. 3, lines 54-57) and includes voice analysis means (Col. 4, lines 7-9). Network access points 2 are connected to network 4 and temporarily store voice messages transferred from platform 1 via network 4 (Col. 4, line 65 - Col. 5, line 5). Van Kommer discloses performing bidirectional communication between user 30 and platform 1 over network 4 (Col. 6, lines 8-35). Guedalia discloses, in Fig. 1, an email management system having an email server 110 and a voice response unit 120 that converts email messages from text to speech using converter 140 (Col. 5, lines 6-12). According to Guedalia, a user reviews a speech converted email message and records an audio reply to the email message by communicating with voice response unit 120 using a telephone connection 150. The audio reply to the email message is sent to the sender's email account or a website (Col. 5, lines 13-29). None of the

Appln. No.: 09/997,391
Amendment Dated October 11, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 11, 2006

MATP-617US

cited art, however, disclose the indicated allowable features of receiving and storing EPG speech files at an information appliance and navigating through the stored EPG speech files in response to aural prompts.

In view of the amendment to claims 1 and 15, claims 1 and 15 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Guedalia. Because claim 6 includes all the limitations of claim 1 from which it depends, claim 6 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Guedalia.

Claim 16 and 21-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Guedalia and further in view of Hong et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,737,030). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Guedalia and further in view of Oh (U.S. Pat. No. 6,141,642). Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Guedalia and further in view of Cannon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,510,209). Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Guedalia and further in view of Stephens (U.S. Pat. No. 6,557,026). Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Guedalia, in view of Hong et al, in further view of Oh.

Claims 5, 9, 10 and 22 include all of the features of claim 1 from which they depend; and claims 16, 20 and 21 include all the limitations of claim 15 from which they depend. These claims are patentable over Van Kommer and Guedalia for the same reasons as claims 1 and 15.

Applicant incorporates by reference the description of Hong. et al., Oh, Cannon et al. and Stephens presented in the Amendment filed on August 9, 2006. None of the cited references disclose the indicated allowable features of receiving and storing EPG speech files at an information appliance and navigating through the stored EPG speech files in response to aural prompts.

The cited art taken singularly or in combination does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 1 or claim 15. Accordingly, claims 16 and 21-22, which include all of the features of respective claim 15 and claim 1 from which they depend are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Guedalia and further in

Appln. No.: 09/997,391
Amendment Dated October 11, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 11, 2006

MATP-617US

view of Hong et al. Claim 5, which includes all of the features of claim 1 from which it depends is also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Guedalia in further in view of Oh. Claim 9, which includes all of the features of claim 1 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Guedalia and further in view of Cannon et al. Claim 10, which includes all of the features of claim 1 from which it depends is also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Guedalia and in further view of Stephens. Claim 20, which includes all of the features of claim 15 from which it depends is also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Guedalia, in view of Hong et al., and further in view of Oh.

In view of the forgoing remarks, Applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 15, 16, and 20-22.

Respectfully submitted,


Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549
Attorney for Applicants

KNN/drm/pb

Dated: October 11, 2006

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 18-0350 for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (571-273-8300) on the date shown below.

October 11, 2006


Denise Marshall

PB_H:VWRPORTBLVRPAPCBOCELLAV1874_1.DOC